

**REMARKS:**

This amendment is in response to an office action dated August 23, 2004. Applicants provisionally elect species I. Fig. 5, drawn to Claims 1-22, with traverse and cancel Claims 23-28 (if the Examiner maintains the restriction requirement), and add new Claim 29. As will be discussed, with the addition of claim 29, which is a generic claim including both methods of claims 1 and 23, it is urged that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn. Claim 29 adds the step of sensing acceleration of a motor shaft. Antecedent basis for this step is found at least at: page 7, line 20 to page 8, line 1; and page 9, lines 9 – 21. If acceleration is sensed then the method of claim 1 is employed and if acceleration is not sensed, then the method of claim 23 is employed to control tape movement. Because claim 29 is generic to both methods and would encompass a search on both methods, it is urged that all claims are generic and that the restriction requirement is now improper and should be withdrawn.

For the above reasons and for reasons of record in the application, reconsideration of the above identified Application, withdrawal of the restriction requirement, and allowance of claims 1-29 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SHIBA P. PANDA, ET AL.

By: 

Timothy R. Schulte  
Registration No. 29,013  
Attorney for Applicants

Date: November 30, 2004  
STORAGE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION  
One StorageTek Drive, MS-4309  
Louisville, Colorado 80028-4309  
Telephone: (303) 673-5989  
Facsimile: (303) 673-4151

Serial No. 09/917,354,  
Filed July 30, 2001

Attorney Docket No. 2001-004-TAP